

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/921,908		YAMADA, HIDEAKI	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Mark R. Milia		2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mark R. Milia. (3) Robert Downs.
 (2) Joseph R. Pokrzywa. (4) Shinya Hirata.

Date of Interview: 06 December 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mitchell and Otani.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed claim 1 and the language associated with the Amendment to the claim. Applicant and examiner disagree as to the meaning of "an encoder portion" and to the fact that claim 1 states "a coding block unit" not necessarily located within the encoder portion. There is disagreement as to the obviousness to combine the references of Otani and Mitchell. Examiner believes further clarity of the claim language is needed to render the application apart from the cited references. Examiner believes that the encoding block unit could refer to a memory location.